

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 97-6246**

---

VICTOR TOWNES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CITY OF BALTIMORE; UNKNOWN BALTIMORE CITY UNIFORM, and Possible Plainclothes Police Officers and their Superiors; UNKNOWN BALTIMORE FIRE & AMBULANCE SERVICE ATTENDANTS; UNKNOWN FIELD DIRECTORS OF THE BALTIMORE F.B.I. OFFICE; BALTIMORE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT; UNKNOWN BALTIMORE CITY POLICE COMMISSIONER; UNKNOWN COMMISSIONER FOR THE BALTIMORE CITY FIRE AND AMBULANCE SERVICES; VAUGHN FOREMAN, Trooper; SAMUEL N. WICHNER, Special Agent,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William M. Nickerson, District Judge. (CA-95-3529-WMN)

---

Submitted: May 1, 1997

Decided: May 13, 1997

---

Before WIDENER and MURNAGHAN, Circuit Judges, and PHILLIPS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Victor Townes, Appellant Pro Se. Frank Charles Derr, Assistant City Solicitor, William Rowe Phelan, Jr., OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR, Baltimore, Maryland; Charles Joseph Peters, Sr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland; Duane Anthony

Verderaime, BALTIMORE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT, Baltimore, Maryland;  
John Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland;  
Donald E. Hoffman, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND,  
Pikesville, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals a district court order dismissing some, but not all, parties from his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1994) action. We dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because the order is non-dispositive as to the entire action and therefore not appealable. This court may exercise jurisdiction only over final orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1291 (1994), and certain interlocutory and collateral orders, 28 U.S.C. § 1292 (1994); Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b); Cohen v. Beneficial Indus. Loan Corp., 337 U.S. 541 (1949). The order here appealed is neither a final order nor an appealable interlocutory or collateral order.

We dismiss the appeal as interlocutory. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

